

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-16 and 18-24 are pending in the application, with 1, 15, and 18 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 15 are sought to be amended. These changes introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objections to the Claims

With respect to claim 15, the Examiner contends there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the third and fourth pins." Claim 15 has been amended to remove the referencing language of "the" in order to clarify the declaration of "third and fourth pins."

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,264,958 ("Johnson"). Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature that the interface can electronically change between the first and second standard. This feature is not disclosed by Johnson. For at least this reason, therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by

this reference. Because the above-referenced feature is now in claim 1, this feature is likewise present in claims 2-14 and 21-24.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0103219 ("Okazaki"). The Examiner premises this rejection on the earlier argument that all features of claim 1 are disclosed by Johnson. As discussed above, Johnson fails to disclose all features of claim 1 as amended. Furthermore, although Okazaki teaches IEEE 1394-1995/1394a-2000 standards, both of which are DS (data-strobe) signaling standards, Okazaki does not teach IEEE 1394b-2002, which is a SerDes signaling standard with clock recovery (Beta). Because this feature of claim 2 is not disclosed or suggested by Okazaki or by any other cited reference, this claim is not obvious over the cited references when considered alone or together.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 3-14 and 21-24 as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,559,967 ("Oprescu"). The Examiner premises this rejection on the earlier argument that all features of claim 1 are disclosed by Johnson. As discussed above, Johnson fails to disclose all features of claim 1 as amended and this claim is therefore not obvious over the cited references when considered alone or together.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 15 as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Oprescu. Claim 15 has been amended to include the feature that both of the recited sections are contained within a single port and that the two standards are distinct.

These features are not disclosed or suggested in either Johnson or Opreescu. For at least this reason, therefore, claim 15 is not obvious over the cited references when considered alone or together.

In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 16 as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Opreescu in further view of Okazaki. These dependent claims necessarily include all features of claim 15 as amended. Because the above-referenced feature is now in claim 15, this feature is likewise present in claim 16. Given that this feature is not disclosed in Johnson, Opreescu, or Okazaki, these references fail to disclose all features of claim 16. This claim is therefore not obvious over the cited references when considered alone or together.

Claims 18-20 are directed to a method of the system of claims 1-14. Because none of the cited references disclose or suggest the system of claims 1-14, either alone or in combination as described above, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the features of claims 18-20. These claims are not obvious over the cited references when considered alone or together.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: June 26, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600